An important misdirection was caused by the Academy edition of Leibniz's philosophical papers, which published an untitled text of 1677 under the editors' heading *Spatium et motus revera relationes* ('Space and motion are in fact relations').[24] In it, Leibniz does indeed state that motion is relational and then adds that space 'is not a thing' (*res non est*). No more than that, though: nowhere in this text does Leibniz claim that space is relational. The editors' slip is understandable, for all the conceptual reasons expounded above. Yet, this editorial title has misled several authoritative scholars into thinking that Leibniz already endorsed a relational theory of space in 1677.[25]

There were further issues with the main texts needed to establish the connection with Newton. Leibniz consistently claimed only to have read Newton's *Principia* after 1689, namely after the publication of the *Tentamen de motuum coelestium causis*, in which he offered an explanation of the planetary system that was different from Newton's. This dating would not fit with our story, since Leibniz's early statements about the relationality of space are from 1688.[26] In 1991, however, Domenico Bertoloni Meli proved that Leibniz had read Newton's work *before* writing his own essays in natural philosophy, as attested by his handwritten notes on the *Principia* and the drafts of the *Tentamen*.[27] Leibniz's claim of independence was a lie—Newton himself never believed it—and his reading of the *Principia* dated to the fall of 1688.[28]

But the publication of Leibniz's works has also led to the opposite mistake. The text in which Leibniz first advanced a relational theory of space,

[24] A VI, 4, N. 359, 1968. For the complete text, see below, note 78.

[25] See, for instance, R. T. W. Arthur (ed.), *Leibniz: The Labyrinth of the Continuum* [*Labyrinth*] (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 410; Arthur, 'Leibniz's Space', 506; Arthur, *Leibniz*, 130 and esp. 155, where the passage is quoted in such a way as to make it say what it does not; P. Lodge, 'Leibniz on Relativity and the Motion of Bodies', *Philosophical Topics*, 31 (2003), 277–308, at 305, n. 23. Examples could be multiplied.

[26] Leibniz had already stated this in the *Tentamen* itself, GM VI 181; the claim is repeated in subsequent correspondence with Huygens on the same subject (A III, 4, N. 282, 610), as well as in a letter to Mencke (see H. W. Turnbull, J. F. Scott, A. Rupert Hall, L. Tilling [eds.], *The Correspondence of Isaac Newton* [*Newton*] [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959–77], vol. 3, 3–7).

[27] D. Bertoloni Meli, 'Public Claims, Private Worries: Newton's *Principia* and Leibniz's Theory of Planetary Motion', *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science. Part A*, 22 (1991), 415–49.

[28] Thus Newton referred to Leibniz's essays on physics: 'But Mr. Leibnitz cannot be a Witness in his own Cause. It lies upon him either to prove that he found them before Mr. Newton, or to quit his claim. . . . For the Propositions contained in them (Errors and Trifles excepted) are Mr. Newton's (or easy Corollaries from them) being published by him in other Forms of Words before' (I. Newton, 'An Account of the Book entituled Commercium Epistolicum', *Philosophical Transaction of the Royal Society of London*, 342 [1715], 173–224, at 209). Newton's own annotations on Leibniz's *Tentamen* have been published in Turnbull, *Newton*, vol. 6, 116–22.

Материал, защищенный авторским правом